



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,272	02/14/2000	Mikko Maattanen	297-009192-US(PAR)	6323

7590
Clarence A Green
Perman & Green
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430

05/24/2004

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2681

10

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/503,272

Applicant(s)

MAATTANEN ET AL.

Examiner

Huy D Nguyen

Art Unit

2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/15/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 22-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In response to the restriction requirement (paper No. 8), the applicant has elected claims 1, 22-28, related to display structure, to be examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 22-24, 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,772) in view of Desblancs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,859).

Regarding claims 1 and 28, Jonsson et al. disclose a cellular telephone that comprises printed circuit board 50, keypad 30, display 40, outer cover 20 (Fig. 2) consisting of two parts 23 & 24, and frame construction 22 (Fig. 2) which is a mechanical entity separated from printed circuit board 50, keypad 30, display 40, outer cover 20, into which the above parts are mechanically coupled (see FIG. 1 and 2 and Col. 3, lines 19-35). Jonsson et al. does not teach reader for a detachable memory module. Desblancs et al. teaches a mobile phone with a memory card reader (see FIG. 1 and Col. 2, lines 24-25). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2681

skill in the art at time the invention was made to include in Jonsson et al.'s telephone a memory card reader as disclosed in Desblancs et al. to allow the phone to receive memory card.

Regarding claims 22 and 24, Jonsson et al. teach a mechanical construction according to claim 1, wherein the display is a separately assembled stack of layers comprising a window, a liquid crystal display unit and a bottom plate (col. 3, lines 28-32, lines 52-53).

Regarding claim 23, Jonsson et al. teach a mechanical construction according to claim 22, wherein one of the outer cover parts of the mobile telecommunication device defines a display opening and has a certain thickness at the edge of said display opening, and said window comprises a portion elevated by said certain thickness for filling said opening so that in an assembled mechanical construction an outer surface of the aggregate formed by said outer cover part and said window is essentially even (col. 3, lines 28-35; Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 26 and 27, Jonsson et al. teach a mechanical construction according to claim 22, comprising, at the edges of said display, mechanical means for aligning the display in relation with the printed circuit board (col. 4, lines 37-38, lines 34-43).

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,772) in view of Desblancs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,859) and Beiswenger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,958,911).

Regarding claim 25, the combination of Jonsson et al. and Desblancs et al. fails to disclose the display comprising an elastomeric conductor arrangement. Beiswenger et al. teach that the drivers typically connect to the liquid crystal display terminals through a conductive elastomeric connector (see Col. 1, lines 58-61). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to use conductive elastomeric connector as

Art Unit: 2681

disclosed in Beiswenger et al. for the telephone of the combination since it provides endurance to the connection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-3283. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Erika A Gary can be reached on 703-308-0123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2681

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

W


ERIKA G. [unclear]
PATENT EXAMINER